

Remarks

Claims 1 and 45-63 are in the Application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Claims Rejections

Claims 1, 45-49, and 53-62 were rejected as obvious pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Black (US 6,786,354) in view of McGunn (US 6,724,303).

Claims 50-52 and 63 were rejected as obvious pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Black in view of McGunn and Kuel (GB 2,202,066).

Claim 1

The Office has presented no evidence of record that Black's latch (16) constitutes a cassette *lock* including a "movable locking member" such that "with the locking member in the locked position the cassette is *prevented* from being opened." Nor can the Office expand the definition of "latch" to always consist of a lock. Conversely, the definition of "latch" by Merriam-Webster OnLine Dictionary (copy attached) teaches away from a latch being a lock. The Office's own classification definitions (e.g., class 292) indicate there are latching devices without lock structure. That is, the Office itself concludes that a latch is not required to comprise a lock. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand that a "latch" differs from a "lock." The Examiner's assertions are not based on any evidence of record. *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 59 USPQ2d 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2001). *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

The Action also provides no support for associating every latch with a chest, as alleged on Action pages 2 and 6. It follows that the Action provides no basis for limiting the definition of every latch to "a lock to secure items stored inside a chest", as alleged. The Office also confuses an "automated banking machine chest" and a "cassette" for use therein.


The Office has not responded to Applicants' argument that there is no evidence in McGunn that the relied upon keypad (224) is used to control the electronic lock (104) of the safe (102). As McGunn's lock control can be remotely carried out with the control unit (120), the safe (102) doesn't include or need a lock control keypad thereon.

Nor has the Office responded to Applicants' argument that McGunn's safe (102) does not constitute a cassette, especially a *cassette* that is used in an automated banking machine *chest* (e.g., safe) that has a chest lock for controlling access to the chest. The references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest putting a lock control keypad on a *cassette* that goes inside an automated banking machine *chest*, especially where the keypad "is operative to receive user input to move the locking member to the unlocked position." It follows that the references, even in combination, cannot teach or suggest the recited features and relationships. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For reasons previously discussed, the references, taken alone or in combination, also do not teach or suggest the recited features and relationships of the other pending claims.

Allowance of all of Applicants' pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Ralph E. Locke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000